

## IRAQ AND THE "BOLDER APPROACH"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, appeared on "Meet the Press" yesterday morning and made this assertion, and I quote Dr. Rice: "... when we were attacked on September 11, we had a choice to make. We could decide that the proximate cause was al Qaeda and the people who flew those planes into the buildings and, therefore, we would go after al Qaeda and perhaps after the Taliban and then our work would be done..."

"Or we could take a bolder approach, which was to say that we had to go after the root causes of the kind of terrorism that was produced there, and that meant a different kind of Middle East. And there is no one who could have imagined a different kind of Middle East with Saddam Hussein still in power."

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the weapons of mass destruction? In the run up to the war, no one said anything about a bolder approach.

We were told about uranium purchases from Niger. We were told about the world's most dangerous weapons falling into the hands of the wrong people. We were told by Dr. Rice herself about the specter of mushroom clouds over American cities. We were treated to a campaign of fear and deception about weapons of mass destruction because the Bush administration knew that was the only way to convince the Nation and the Congress to commit to this war.

They knew that this bolder approach, this ideological pipe dream, was an absolute nonstarter.

So what are we supposed to tell Cindy Sheehan and the thousands of other mothers, fathers, spouses, siblings, and friends of dead soldiers and soldiers who were wounded? That their children died or were wounded not to protect America but for some "bolder approach," because the Middle East is the personal chess board of a gang of neoconservatives who have not had to sacrifice a thing for this war?

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Iraq a few weeks ago to meet the troops to learn more about their mission. I cannot tell the Members how impressed I was with the courage, the loyalty, and intelligence of our soldiers from the officers down to the citizen soldiers of the National Guard. They are, indeed, the best America has to offer.

My question is: Why can we not have political leaders with the same honor and integrity as the men and women who wear the uniform, who take the risks, who make the sacrifices? It is nothing short of tragic the way the Pentagon and the White House have let down and even exploited the men and women in their charge. They sent them to Iraq on false pretenses, on a poorly

defined mission, without all the tools they needed and without a plan to bring them home.

I have been calling for our troops to come home this entire year. I have called for hearings. I have introduced resolutions. I have forced a vote in this Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not just speaking for myself. A majority of Americans clearly share this anxiety and skepticism about the war.

I have tried to jumpstart the conversation about how to go about ending the occupation. At the hearing I convened last month, some very sound ideas were laid out about how to end this debacle and how the United States can play a constructive role in the rebuilding of Iraqi society.

But the President will not engage on this level. He will not engage in this conversation. He offers nothing but platitudes and vague assertions. Terrorism is bad and freedom is good, he tells us. We need to stay the course, he tells us. We will be there as long as we need to be there, he tells us.

This is not enough. The American people and our soldiers deserve better. They deserve a plan, an endgame, a clear strategy to return Iraq to the Iraqi people and the troops to their families back home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## URGING HELP FOR PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the nation of Pakistan is experiencing the greatest natural disaster

of all time. There is no recorded disaster with the dimensions that the earthquake in Pakistan has produced. Forty thousand at least are already dead. Forty thousand at least are dead already, and with the freezing weather coming and the inaccessibility of the people in the mountains, another 40,000 could easily die, being frozen to death or starved because they cannot be reached. Millions are homeless.

Now is the time for America to come to the aid of this nation in great distress. These are people, first of all; and for humanitarian reasons, we certainly should come to their aid. They are also citizens of Pakistan, a major ally of the United States, a major ally which has done a great deal in the fight against terrorism.

I know disaster fatigue has set in with a lot of Americans and certainly our media. We had the tsunami, an overwhelming disaster. We had Katrina, Rita. In Central America they had Hurricane Stan.

Unfortunately, the media has reached the point of exhaustion too early. Not enough is being said about the great tragedy in Pakistan because I think they just do not want to deal with another great disaster with the kind of coverage it needs. It does not have it.

When we add up all these disasters, the tsunami, Katrina, Rita, and Pakistan, the tragic numbers should not overwhelm us. We should not throw up our hands and say it is just too much, we cannot deal with it. It is the most massive disaster in history, the Pakistani earthquake; but yet 40,000, though it may seem like a lot, and in the case of Katrina we do not know whether it is going to be 10,000 or not, and in the case of the tsunami, if we add them all up, still relative to the population of the world, it is a very small number of people.

We have almost 6 billion people in the world. Surely 6 billion people in the world and almost 200 nations in the world can come to the aid of people who have experienced these disasters this year, can come to the aid of those in Katrina, those in the tsunami, and those in Pakistan. Surely we should not get weary of being weary of disasters so early. We must go to the aid of Pakistan and not write it off because we have had enough disasters. We need more attention paid to this.

When we look at numbers, we lost 600,000 people in the Civil War in America. 600,000. We lost 400,000 or 500,000 in World War II. The Russians lost 18 million people in World War II. Those are numbers which can really overwhelm us. Surely we have dealt with problems on that scale. In World War II we mobilized, and in terms of men and materiel and the effort to win World War II, it was overwhelming.

But it would not take even one-tenth of that effort to go to the aid of Pakistan at this point and deal with getting the practical things that they need. They need helicopters because those